

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above identified patent application is hereby respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 3, 19, and 20 have been canceled and claims 1, 8, and 13 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, and 4-18 remain in the case.

The applicant appreciated the thoroughness of the review by Examiner Sue Weaver.

A petition and Fee for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and payment thereof for a one-month extension is attached hereto.

1. The drawings were objected to by the Examiner for two reasons. Claim 3 has been canceled, therefore the objection to the angle recited is overcome and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Figures 1 and 4 were objected to because they showed modified forms of construction in the same view. It is believed that all elements are plainly shown and do not detract from an understanding of the invention. Therefore, it is believed that the original drawings were in compliance

with all statutory requirements. Clarification as to what it is that the Examiner is objecting to and what changes to the drawings the Examiner wishes to have accomplished is respectfully requested if the enclosed changes, as described hereinafter, are not deemed to be satisfactory.

Nevertheless, as a bona-fide effort to comply with the Examiner's requirements four proposed formal drawing sheets are enclosed with the "modifications" being removed from original **FIG. 1** and **FIG. 4** and shown in proposed new drawings **FIG. 5** and **FIG. 6**.

Therefore, two new additional drawing figures 5 and 6 have been added and original Figures 1 and 2 have had material removed therefrom. The modifications removed from original Figures 1 and 2 are now shown only in new figures 5 and 6. The new material shown in Figures 5 and 6 is derived from original Figures 1 and 2 and as was described in the specification. Therefore, no new matter has been added in the new drawing figures.

These changes comply, as best as can be determined, with the wishes of the Examiner. As the Examiner did not specify what modifications were being objected to, a careful reading of the specification and of the drawing figures was

required. All elements that are thought to represent possible modifications that were detected are believed to have been withdrawn from the original drawings.

The applicant and undersigned desire that the application should include clarity of disclosure sufficient so that those possessing ordinary skill in the art can readily understand and therefore eventually benefit from the disclosure.

After careful review of the specification, the only "modified forms of construction" shown in the first drawing that could be found were the first tie strap 38 and the second tie strap 36. These have been eliminated from **FIG. 1** and added to **FIG. 5**.

As these modifications did not block view of any part of the primary disclosure and as they represent the most minor of modifications, the need for corrected drawings by the Examiner is unclear. A great deal of work has been required to detect these "modifications" and to provide the proposed new drawing sheets, edit the specification, and comment in the Remarks section accordingly.

Furthermore, it appears the forcing the reader to alternate from amongst the additional two drawing figures just to locate the first and second "modified" tie straps 38, 38 potentially renders the application more, rather than less, difficult to comprehend.

A similar argument applies against the removal of the edge zipper 66 and the alternate edge zipper 68 from **FIG. 4** and adding these elements to new **FIG. 6**, as has been accomplished.

Does the Examiner believe that the inclusion of these "modified" elements, if allowed to remain as a part of original **FIG. 1** and **FIG. 4**, contributed to an indefiniteness of the disclosure?

The undersigned can fully appreciate the need for this requirement if there is an absolute statutory requirement that compels the separation of modifications from the basic preferred embodiment or if the Examiner feels that such is necessary for clarity of disclosure. The undersigned has not found exact statutory language that precludes the showing of such modifications nor does the undersigned understand how these elements adversely affected the original disclosure. Could the Examiner please specify where in the Statutes it

is stated that modified forms of construction cannot also be included in the same drawing figure as that of the preferred embodiment?

If this is a matter of personal discretion by the Examiner, the undersigned respectfully reminds the Examiner of the added cost and related impacts incurred by the inventor. In this instance, the inventor has had to bear a substantial cost-impact to remove these few elements.

As stated above, a bona-fide effort to fully comply with the request of the Examiner has taken place to the best ability of the undersigned, as understood. If additional or different correction is desired, please notify the undersigned as to what is required so that compliance can occur.

2. The recitation of 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph and the rejection of claims 8 and 13 thereunder, are noted.

Claims 8 and 13 have been amended to correct antecedent basis. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

3-6. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 are noted and are believed to be overcome, as described hereinafter.

7. Claim 19 was objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and including the limitations of any intervening claims. Thank you.

This has been accomplished. There were no intervening claims. The limitations of now canceled claim 19 have been combined with claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore believed to be in condition of allowance.

The remaining claims depend from allowable claim 1 and further limit the scope of the invention. Accordingly, the remaining dependent claims 2, and 4-18 are also believed to be in condition of allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Certain of the prior art made of record and not relied upon that is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure has been reviewed by the undersigned, but is deemed no more relevant than the applied references.

As all remaining claims 1, 2, and 4-18 appear to be in condition of allowance, reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested, and a notice of allowance is courteously urged at the earliest time.

9. The suggested format for the certificate of mail is noted. The current certificate of mail has been modified to better comply with the suggested format. Thank you.

10. The applicant appreciates the opportunity to communicate by telephone with the Examiner if necessary. Please continue to direct all correspondence to the correspondence address and telephone as shown below.

Respectfully submitted,



Jan 9, 2006

Risto A. Rinne, Jr.
Reg. # 37,055

2173 East Francisco Blvd.
Suite E
San Rafael, CA 94901

1-415-457-6933